UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,262	03/31/2004	John F. Engelhardt	875.074US1	7471

21186 7590 10/30/2007

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
HILL, KEVIN KAI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1633	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,262	ENGELHARDT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin K. Hill, Ph.D.	1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *August 14 and 22, 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-46 and 48-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3,25-27,29-42,45,51-53 and 55-59* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7,9-24,28,43,44,46,48-50 and 54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Applicant has elected with traverse the invention of Group I, Claims 1-32 and 43-60, drawn to a method of enhancing recombinant adeno-associated virus (rAAV) transduction in mammalian cells, comprising contacting the mammalian cells with at least one agent in an amount effective to additively or synergistically enhance rAAV transduction.

Within Group I, Applicant has further elected the restricted subgroup "A", wherein the at least two agents additively enhance rAAV transduction.

Within Group I, Applicant has elected the following species:

a) the agent interaction effect species "ii), wherein the agent alters cellular uptake of rAAV, as recited in Claims 4 and 46.

b) the biological functionality associated with an agent species "vi", wherein the agent modulates rAAV processing in the cell, as recited in Claims 28, 43 and 54.

c) the agent category species "xiii and xiv", wherein the agents are an antibiotic and a chemotherapeutic, as recited in Claims 8 and 47.

d) the biological functionality species "doxil" and "LLnL", as recited in Claims 21 and 60. However, upon further examination of the subject matter, the Examiner has extended the species under examination to include doxorubicin.

e) the cell type species "mammalian lung cell", as recited in Claims 16 and 48.

f) the polypeptide biological functionality species "cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR)", as recited in Claim 20, wherein CFTR is found in both rAAVs.

Amendments

Applicant's response and amendments, filed August 14, 2007, to the prior Office Action is acknowledged. Applicant has cancelled Claims 8, 47 and 60, withdrawn Claims 3, 25-27, 29-42, 45, 51-53 and 55-59, and amended Claims 1, 21 and 43.

Claims 3, 25-27, 29-42, 45, 51-53 and 55-59 are pending but withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-24, 28, 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 54 are under consideration.

Examiner's Note

Unless otherwise indicated, previous objections/rejections that have been rendered moot in view of the amendment will not be reiterated. The arguments in the August 14, 2007 response will be addressed to the extent that they apply to current rejection(s).

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application parent provisional application 60/459,323, filed on March 31, 2003 and 60/512,347, filed on October 16, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Specification

1. **The disclosure stands objected to because of the following informalities**:

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: The specification uses the terms "doxorubicin", "doxyrubicin" and "DOXIL®", each of which may be abbreviated as "DOX". However, the specification discloses that DOXIL® could not be confirmed to be bioavailable to cell culture cells (pg 80, lines 17-18; pg 82, lines 2-4), and that "intranasally DOXIL®-treated mice did better than the doxorubicin-treated animals" (pg 110, lines 17-19). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the functional ability(ies) of "doxorubicin", "doxyrubicin" and "DOXIL®", are not identical in effect. As such, it is imperative that "doxorubicin", "doxyrubicin" and "DOXIL®" be clearly and explicitly identified throughout the disclosure.

A) The use of trademark compositions has been noted in this application. "Miglyol" (pg 54, lines 20-25) is a registered trademark name. Trademarked compositions should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. Applicant is advised to review the specification to correctly identify all trademark compositions.

B) The unit (DF*) categorizing the results in Table 2 (pg 84) are not defined in the table or disclosed in the working example that describes the experiment used to acquire the data (Example 3), thus prohibiting a meaningful evaluation on the merits.

C) The specification discloses that Figure 4B tabulates luciferase activity in HeLa cells infected rAAV, "and co-administration of..., or a combination of LLnL and doxorubicin" (pg 19, lines 26-30). However, none the figure legends of Figures 4A-E identify data from the combined use of LLnL and doxorubicin.

D) Figure 6 consists of three panels, A-C. However, the specification does not disclose the data presented in Figure 6C (pg 20, lines 6-10).

E) The specification does not adequately identify the "DOX" compound whose effects are graphed in Figures 7A-C (pg 20, lines 11-12).

F) Figure 8 consists of three panels, A-C. However, the specification does not disclose which data is presented in its corresponding panel (pg 20, lines 13-16).

G) Figure 9 consists of four panels, A-D. However, the specification does not disclose which data is presented in its corresponding panel (pg 20, lines 17-23).

H) Figure 10 consists of two panels, A-B. However, the specification does not disclose which data is presented in its corresponding panel (pg 20, lines 24-29).

I) Figure 11 consists of four panels, A-D. However, the specification does not disclose which data is presented in its corresponding panel (pgs 20-21, joining ¶).

J) Figure 13 consists of two panels, A-B, wherein the specification discloses the data presented in the corresponding panels as "right panel" and "left panel". (pg 21, lines 18-23) However, there are no "right" or "left" panels. It would be remedial to correctly identify each panel by its Figure title: Figure 13A, Figure 13B. Furthermore, the "indicated drug combinations" are not adequately disclosed for not identifying the "DOX" compound.

K) The specification does not adequately identify the "DOX" compound whose effects are graphed in Figure 17 (pgs 22-23, joining ¶; pg 106, lines 22-32)..

L) The specification does not adequately identify the "DOX" compound whose effects are graphed in Figure 18 (pg 23, lines 2-5; pg 105, Example 7C).

M) The specification does not adequately identify the "DOX" compound whose effects are graphed in Figure 19 (pg 23, lines 6-11; pg 106, Example 7C).

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendments

Applicant argues that the terms "doxorubicin" and "doxyrubicin" are synonymous, and that the active ingredient in DOXIL® is doxorubicin. Furthermore, in the context of the particular data disclosed in the specification (*in vitro* versus *in vivo*), the use of "DOX" in the specification is clear.

Applicant's argument(s) has been fully considered, but is not persuasive.

With respect to A) Applicant has not addressed "Miglyol".

With respect to B) Applicant has not explained the definition of "DF*".

With respect to C)-M), in the absence of explicitly pointing out where (page, line) the distinctions between doxycycline and DOXIL® are taught for each experiment so as to provide clear correspondence with the corresponding data shown in the respective figures, the instant argument is incomplete and unpersuasive. The specification discloses that DOXIL® could not be confirmed to be bioavailable to cell culture cells (pg 80, lines 17-18; pg 82, lines 2-4), and that "intranasally DOXIL®-treated mice did better than the doxorubicin-treated animals" (pg 110, lines 17-19). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the functional ability(ies) of "doxorubicin" or "doxyrubicin" and DOXIL®, are not identical in effect. As such,

it is imperative that "doxorubicin" or "doxyrubicin" and DOXIL® be clearly and explicitly identified throughout the disclosure.

The objection of (E) is withdrawn, in part, in light of "RLU" being defined as "relative luminescence units" (Amendment, pg 17, ¶3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-24, 28, 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,** as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a method for enhancing recombinant adeno-associated virus (rAAV) transduction of a mammalian cell. At issue for the purpose of written description requirements, are a) the identity and structure of the agent that "alters cellular uptake of rAAV", and b) the identity and structure of the agent that "modulates rAAV processing in the cell". It is noted that with respect to Claim 4, the recited agent that alters cellular uptake of rAAV is an undisclosed third agent to be used in the claimed method, wherein the elected first and second agents are DOXIL® and LLnL.

When the claims are analyzed in light of the specification, instant invention recites/encompasses a genus of structurally diverse compositions that are known in the art to possess mechanistically distinct biochemical activities. The lack of written support in the specification regarding the biological function possessed by each contemplated composition so as to be used in the instantly claimed method will be addressed presently.

> *Vas-cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that Applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that (he or she) invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-cath* at page 1116).

With respect to agents capable of altering the cellular uptake of rAAV, in analyzing whether the written description requirement is met for genus claims, it is first determined whether a representative number of species have been described by their complete structure. In the instant case, DOXIL® is the only species whose complete structure is disclosed to perform

such functions. Next, then, it is determined whether a representative number of species have been sufficiently described by other relevant identifying characteristics (i.e. other than nucleotide sequence), specific features and functional attributes that would distinguish different members of the claimed genus. In the instant case, no other identifying characteristics identify *a priori* an agent that would perform the claimed function.

With respect to agents capable of modulating rAAV processing in the cell, in analyzing whether the written description requirement is met for genus claims, it is first determined whether a representative number of species have been described by their complete structure. In the instant case, LLnL, a proteosome inhibitor, is the only species whose complete structure is disclosed to perform such functions. Next, then, it is determined whether a representative number of species have been sufficiently described by other relevant identifying characteristics (i.e. other than nucleotide sequence), specific features and functional attributes that would distinguish different members of the claimed genus. In the instant case, no other identifying characteristics identify *a priori* an agent that would perform the claimed function.

The specification does not disclose any identifying characteristic as to how an artisan would have differentiated a first agent from any other second or third agent so as to alter the cellular uptake of rAAV or modulate intracellular viral processing. It is noted that all these agents vary greatly in structure and function and therefore each represents a subgenus. Again, the members of any of the subgenuses themselves would have very different structure and the specification does not provide any description of any identifying characteristics of the species of the subgenuses

> The Revised Interim Guidelines state:
> "The claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described if the claims require an essential or critical element which is not adequately described in the specification and which is not conventional in the art" (col. 3, page 71434), "when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus", "in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (col. 2, page 71436).
>
> An Applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).
>
> Possession may also be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "ready for patenting" such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 1 19 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998), *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997)*, *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical*, 927 F.2d 1200,

1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it").

Therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1602 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. *In Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

The two species of agents specifically disclosed to perform the claimed functions, DOXIL® and LLnL, are not representative of the genus of agents having distinctly different cell biological activities because the genus is highly variant. Accordingly, given that the specification does not teach what is the complete structure of a single species of the exceptionally broadly-defined "agent" genus that is explicitly disclosed to perform the recited functions, specifically i) alter cellular uptake of rAAV, and ii) modulate rAAV processing in the cell, this limited information is not deemed sufficient to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the Applicant is in possession of the required starting materials to perform the necessary active steps and effect the claimed method, at the time the application was filed.

Thus, for the reasons outlined above, it is concluded that the claims do not meet the requirements for written description under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that with regard to agents that "alter cellular uptake of rAAV", see page 4 of the specification, which discloses that agents that alter cellular uptake of rAAV were known prior to Applicant's filing. Applicant need not describe what is well-known to the art. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 231 U.S.P.Q. 81, 94-95 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant's argument(s) has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. The substantive issue is that the claims are drawn to an enormous genus of undisclosed "agents" that possess distinctly different biological properties. The claimed agents are described only by their function, which does not allow an artisan to immediately conceive the structure of the agent that necessarily performs said function. Furthermore, Applicant has not provided a structural and functional nexus between the argued "known" agents that alter cellular uptake of rAAV and the instantly claimed genus of chemotherapeutic, lipid lowering, antibiotic and food additive agents.

Applicant has not addressed the lack of written description for those agents capable of modulating rAAV processing in the cell.

3. **Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-24, 28, 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

While determining whether a specification is enabling, one considers whether the claimed invention provides sufficient guidance to make and use the claimed invention. If not, whether an artisan would have required undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention and whether working examples have been provided. When determining whether a specification meets the enablement requirements, some of the factors that need to be analyzed are: the breadth of the claims, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the level of one of ordinary skill, the level of predictability in the art, the amount of direction provided by the inventor, the existence of working examples, and whether the quantity of any necessary experimentation to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure is "undue" (*In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2ds 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Furthermore, USPTO does not have laboratory facilities to test if an invention will function as claimed when working examples are not disclosed in the specification. Therefore, enablement issues are raised and discussed based on the state of knowledge pertinent to an art at the time of the invention. And thus, skepticism raised in the enablement rejections are those raised in the art by artisans of expertise.

The Breadth of the Claims and The Nature of the Invention

The breadth of the claim is exceptionally large for encompassing methods of enhancing the transduction of an enormous genus of recombinant adeno-associated viruses (rAAV) to an enormous genus of mammalian cells (both organisms and physiological cell types), wherein the transduction may occur *in vitro*, *ex vivo* or *in vivo*, the method comprising the use of an enormous genus of structurally diverse agents recited to perform a broad genus of distinctly different cell biological effects so as to enhance rAAV transduction in the target cell. Applicant broadly contemplates the term 'viral transduction' to include a broad genus of distinctly different and mutually exclusive cell biological processes, such as endocytosis, trafficking and processing of the rAAV through intracellular compartment(s), e.g., endosomal compartments, decreased viral nucleic acid or protein degradation, increased viral uncoating, or increased nuclear transport of virus or the viral genome, agents that interact with cytoskeletal elements, e.g., microtubules or microfilaments (pg 8, lines 23-27).

The inventive concept in the instant application is that rAAV transduction of a mammalian host cell may be enhanced by administering one or more compounds, e.g. the proteosome inhibitor LLnL or the antibiotic/chemotherapeutic compound contained in DOXIL®.

The State of the Prior Art, The Level of One of Ordinary Skill and The Level of Predictability in the Art

The level of one of ordinary skill in the art of recombinant adeno-associated viral vector design and delivery is considered to be high.

The prior art teaches that most viral gene delivery systems utilized to date have demonstrated significant limitations in practicality and safety due to the level and duration of recombinant transgene expression as well as their induction of host immunogenicity to vector proteins. (Kapturczak et al, Curr. Mol. Med. 1:245-258, 2001; pg 245, Abstract). The principal historical limitation of this vector system, efficiency of rAAV-mediated transduction; has been addressed by efforts to improve the titer, purity, and production capacity of rAAV preparations. RAAV transduction in certain tissues has been limited by the paucity of its receptors on certain cell types (pg 250, col. 1, ¶1). However, innovations have been made with regard to directing rAAV to attach to alternative receptors. (pg 250, col. 2, ¶1). Detailed studies of the AAV capsid proteins have shown that certain sites within the capsid can be intentionally altered to incorporate new targeting ligands. Theoretically, this procedure could be to target a wide variety of different receptors and thus substantially expand the cellular tropism.

Mah et al (Molecular Therapy 6(1):106-112, 2001) teach obstacles impairing the use of rAAV as gene therapy vectors include sub-therapeutic levels of transduction, which is affected by such factors as cellular receptor density, multiplicity of infection and the time of exposure to vector particles, and the ability to target the site of gene transfer (pg 106, col. 1, ¶1). To this end, Mah et al teach the conjugation of microspheres to rAAV vectors to retard the flow of the vector through the vasculature, thus resulting in increased exposure time of vector to target cells (pg 106, col. 2, lines 4-7).

The prior art is silent with respect to the administration of agents, particularly the elected embodiments DOXIL® and LLnL, to enhance rAAV transduction. The claimed methods recite the administration of agents to alter distinctly different cell biological processes to enhance transduction. However, Goncalves (Virology J. 2: 43; 17 pages, 2005) teaches that the events and processes that regulate the trafficking of AAV particles into the nucleus are still not fully understood (pg 5 of 17). An increasingly important area in the development of AAV as a vector concerns the engineering of altered cell tropisms to narrow or broaden rAAV-mediated gene delivery and to increase its efficiency in tissues refractory to AAV2 infection. Cells can be poorly transduced by prototype rAAV2 not only because of low receptor content but also owing to impaired intracellular virion trafficking and uncoating or single-to-double strand genome conversion. Thus, considering that these processes depend either directly or indirectly on capsid conformation, cell targeting strategies determine not only the cell type(s) with which the vector interacts but also critically affect the efficiency of the whole gene transfer process. (pg 7 of 17) Several of these approaches rely on the modification by chemical, immunological or genetic means of the AAV2 capsid structure endowing it with ligands that interact with specific cell surface molecules. Another route to alter rAAV tropism exploits the natural capsid diversity of newly isolated serotypes by packaging rAAV2 genomes into capsids derived from other human or non-human AAV isolates. To this end, up until now, most researchers employ hybrid *trans*-complementing constructs that encode *rep* from AAV2 whereas *cap* is derived from the serotype displaying the cell tropism of choice. For example, experiments published recently using rAAV2

genomes pseudotyped with coats from AAV6 and AAV8 revealed stunning gene transfer efficiencies when these vectors were administered alone at high doses or in combination with a blood vessel permeating agent.

It is noted that Yan et al (J. Virology 78(6):2863-2874, 2004; *of record) teach that doxorubicin is an inhibitor of proteosome proteolytic activity, specifically the chymotrypsin-like proteolytic activity of the 20S proteosome (pg 2864, col. 1, ¶2; pg 2873, col. 2, lines 1-3), which contradicts the agent elected species recited in Claims 43 and 60, wherein the doxorubicin and DOXIL® are recited to not be an inhibitor of proteosome proteolytic activity.

Duan et al (J. Clin. Invest. 105:1573-1587, 2000; *of record) teach that the administration of tripeptide protease inhibitors, e.g. LLnL, increase rAAV gene delivery (pg 1573, Abstract). However, this phenomena is not universal in that the proteosome inhibitor did not affect transduction of skeletal or cardiac muscle, indicating that tissue-specific ubiquitination of viral capsid proteins interfere with rAAV-2 transduction.

Given the limited teachings in the art regarding the co-administration of two or more compounds designed to specifically alter particular cell biological processes to intentionally enhance rAAV transduction of an enormous genus of mammalian cell types *in vitro*, *ex vivo* and *in vivo*, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude that a high degree of unpredictability regarding an *a priori* determination that any specific compound will enhance viral transduction. It necessarily follows that the art recognizes significant unpredictability for any two agents to yield an additive interaction to enhance viral transduction. Furthermore, there is a clear contradiction between the art and the instant specification regarding the biochemical properties of the doxorubicin and DOXIL® as per the inhibition of proteosome proteolytic activity.

The Existence of Working Examples and The Amount of Direction Provided by the Inventor

The method steps of the invention require the artisan to administer one or more compounds (or agents), wherein each compound is capable of fulfilling a recited function, namely i) alter cellular uptake of rAAV, ii) modulate rAAV processing in the cell, and iii) processing in intracellular compartments. Applicant broadly contemplates the term viral transduction to include endocytosis, trafficking and processing of the rAAV through intracellular compartment(s), e.g., endosomal compartments, decreased viral nucleic acid or protein degradation, increased viral uncoating, or increased nuclear transport of virus or the viral genome, agents that interact with cytoskeletal elements, e.g., microtubules or microfilaments (pg 8, lines 23-27). However, neither the claims nor the specification disclose explicitly which compound performs the recited function(s). For example, method Claims 4 and 46 recite the limitation "cellular uptake of rAAV" in reference to a cellular function modified by exposure to a second (Claim 46) or third (Claim 4) agent. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The specification fails to use the phrase 'cellular uptake'. Thus, it necessarily follows that the specification fails to disclose specific agent compositions that can perform the claimed function. Rather, the specification discloses the phrases 'viral uptake' and "AAV uptake' (pg 75, lines 18-21). However, there are no specifically disclosed agents that alter 'viral uptake' besides LLnL and EGTA (pg 72, lines 10-15) so as to apprise the artisan exactly what agent is to be administered to fulfill the method step limitation(s).

The lack of correlation in the specification regarding the particular cell biological activity(ies) affected by each contemplated agent necessarily fails to provide sufficient guidance to the artisan so as to perform the claimed method(s). In the instant case, Applicant has elected the agent structure species "DOXIL®" and "LLnL", and the agent function species "alters cellular uptake of rAAV" and "modulates rAAV processing in the cell". The specification discloses DOXIL® to be a chemotherapeutic agent (pg 79, line 20) and is disclosed to enhance rAAV transduction (pg 82, line 31). DOXIL® is the liposomal formulation of doxorubicin (pg 80, line 17) that is an approved antibiotic (pg 9, line 25) and chemotherapeutic agent (pg 79, line 20). The specification also discloses that "LLnL" is a proteosome inhibitor that can enhance transduction (pg 5, line 30), but acts at a point distal to (that is, after) virus binding and entry (pg 70, line 8). LLnL and doxorubicin synergistically enhance rAAV transduction *in vitro*, as measured by reporter gene expression 1000-fold, while individually, doxorubicin and LLnL enhanced rAAV reporter gene expression 100- and 10-fold, respectively (pg 12, lines 8-10).

However, the instantly elected embodiment is DOXIL®, not doxorubicin. It is noted that DOXIL® could not be confirmed to be bioavailable to cell culture cells (pg 80, lines 17-18; pg 82, lines 2-4), and that "intranasally DOXIL®-treated mice did better than the doxorubicin-treated animals" (pg 110, lines 17-19). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the functional ability(ies) of DOXIL® are not identical to doxorubicin, limiting the context in which DOXIL® may be used in combination with another agent(s) to enhance rAAV transduction. The specification fails to disclose the *in vitro*, *ex vivo* or *in vivo* administration of DOXIL® with any other agent, e.g. the elected LLnL embodiment, to a mammalian target cell. Thus, it naturally follows that there is no evidence that the co-administration of DOXIL® with LLnL will yield a functional interaction so as to additively enhance rAAV transduction of mammalian cells.

The Examiner also notes that the newly amended claims, wherein the proteasome modulating agent is now claimed to inhibit proteasome protease activity, teach away from the originally filed disclosure that the agent may modulate the proteosome, but does not inhibit proteolytic activity of the proteosome (pg 7, lines 13-18).

The Quantity of Any Necessary Experimentation to Make or Use the Invention

Thus, the quantity of necessary experimentation to make or use the invention as claimed, based upon what is known in the art and what has been disclosed in the specification, will create an undue burden for a person of ordinary skill in the art to demonstrate that the administration of an enormous genus of structurally and functionally diverse compositions so as to affect a broad genus of distinctly different and mutually exclusive cell biological processes will yield an additive functional interaction so as to enhance rAAV transduction of enormous genus of mammalian cells (both organisms and physiological cell types), wherein the transduction may occur *in vitro*, *ex vivo* or *in vivo*.

The instant portion of the invention, as claimed, falls under the "germ of an idea" concept defined by the CAFC. The court has stated that "patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable". The court continues to say that "tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not

constitute an enabling disclosure" and that "the specification, not knowledge in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement". (See *Genentech Inc v. Novo NordiskA/S* 42 USPQ2d 1001, at 1005). The claimed methods of enhancing rAAV transduction comprising contacting a mammalian cell with an enormous genus of structurally and functionally diverse compositions so as to affect a broad genus of distinctly different and mutually exclusive cell biological processes constitute such a "germ of an idea".

The courts have stated that reasonable correlation must exist between scope of exclusive right to patent application and scope of enablement set forth in patent application. 27 USPQ2d 1662 *Exparte Maizel*. In the instant case, in view of the lack of guidance, working examples, breadth of the claims, the level of skill in the art and state of the art at the time of the claimed invention was made, it would have required undue experimentation to make and/or use the invention as claimed.

Accordingly, the instant claims are rejected for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that:

a) It is well-settled that it is not necessary that a patent applicant have prepared and tested all the embodiments of his invention in order to meet the requirements of §112. Furthermore, enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. The key word is "undue" not "experimentation." It is Applicant's specification that provides the requisite predictability that certain agents together enhance rAAV transduction.

b) The Examiner is requested to consider that the present specification discloses that "proteosome modulating agents" do not include agents that inhibit the proteolytic activity of the proteosome, that doxorubicin may facilitate viral binding to the proteasome and/or subsequent transportation into the nucleus in contrast to proteasome inhibitors such as LLnL and Z-LLL that more significantly inhibit core proteolytic activity of the proteasome, and that the combined use of agents that individually have different or overlapping properties that alter rAAV transduction, as well as agents with similar or identical properties, can result in an additive and/or synergistic effect (pages 7 and 9).

Applicant's argument(s) has been fully considered, but is not persuasive.

With respect to a), as *In re Gardner, Roe and Willey*, 427 F.2d 786,789 (C.C.P.A. 1970), the skilled artisan might eventually find out how to use the invention after "a great deal of work". In the case of *In re Gardner, Roe and Willey*, the invention was a compound which the inventor claimed to have antidepressant activity, but was not enabled because the inventor failed to disclose how to use the invention based on insufficient disclosure of effective drug dosage. The court held that "the law requires that the disclosure in the application shall inform them how to use, not how to find out how to use for themselves". In the instant case, the claims embrace rAAV transduction *in vivo* and the instant specification does not disclose formulations of the enormous genus of structurally undisclosed agents identified only by their functional activity in a cell, wherein the at least two agents from said enormous genus are used in an amount that together at least additively enhance rAAV transduction *in vitro*, *ex vivo* and in a patient.

The courts have stated that reasonable correlation must exist between scope of exclusive right to patent application and scope of enablement set forth in patent application. 27 USPQ2d 1662 *Exparte Maizel*. The claims embrace an enormous genus of agents, each possessing distinctly different structural and functional properties. While the specification discloses that LLnL and doxorubicin synergistically enhance rAAV transduction *in vitro*, the artisan would essentially have to experiment by trial and error each combinatorial permutation of compounds embraced by the claims and capable of performing the recited functions so as to essentially invent for themselves a method of enhancing rAAV transduction *in vitro*, *ex vivo* and *in vivo*. In view of the lack of guidance, working examples, breadth of the claims, the level of skill in the art and state of the art at the time of the claimed invention was made, it would have required undue experimentation to make and/or use the invention as claimed.

With respect to b), the Examiner has considered the specification as originally filed disclosing that the agent may modulate the proteosome, but does not inhibit proteolytic activity of the proteosome (pg 7, lines 13-18). The art teaches that doxorubicin, the active ingredient of DOXIL®, is an inhibitor of proteosome proteolytic activity, specifically the chymotrypsin-like proteolytic activity of the 20S proteosome (Yan et al; *of record). Similarly, LLnL is also an art-recognized inhibitor of proteosome proteolytic activity (Duan et al; *of record; see also Zhang et al (J. Biol. Chem. 282(31):22460-22471, 2007; pg 22464, Figure 2). Thus, both the first and

second agents of the elected invention are art-recognized agents that inhibit proteosome proteolytic activity. While Applicant may believe that doxorubicin may facilitate viral binding to the proteasome and/or subsequent transportation into the nucleus (pg 9, lines 25-26), the agent inherently possesses inhibitory activity of proteosome proteolytic activity as a fundamental property. Furthermore, neither the claims nor the specification disclose a critical concentration of doxorubicin/DOXIL® for use in the claimed method necessary and sufficient to facilitate viral binding to the proteasome and/or subsequent transportation into the nucleus but not inhibit proteosome proteolytic activity in a given cell. The specification does not clearly define and distinguish those "proteasome modulating agents" that do or do not inhibit proteasome proteolytic activity, and which proteaseome modulating agents are or are not to be used in the inventive method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-24, 28, 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the correlation between the identity and structural limitations of each composition/agent and the recited cellular effect achieved by that agent. Claims 1, 4, 28, 43, 46 and 54 recite cellular functions achieved by one or more agents, but the identity of the agent that performs the function is not recited. Conversely, Claims 21 and 43 several agents, but the function each agent performs in the target cell so as to achieve the inventive method is not recited. Dependent claims are included in the basis of the rejection because although they recite and encompass the method of using one or more agents, they do not clarify the nature of which agent performs which activity.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that as amended, the claims are directed to a method to enhance rAAV transduction of a mammalian cell, which method employs at least two agents, where one agent is a chemotherapeutic, a lipid lowering agent, an antibiotic or a food additive and a second agent inhibits proteosome proteolytic activity, or where one agent is epoxomicin, doxorubicin, DOXIL®, daunorubicin, idarubicin, epirubicin, aclarubicin, simvastatin or tannic acid.

Applicant's argument(s) has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. The substantive issue is the claims do not identify which agent performs which function. Is it Applicant's position that each of the recited agents can perform each of the recited functions? Clarification is required.

5. **Claims 21 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite a trademarked product, DOXIL®. If the trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. In fact, the value of a trademark would be lost to the extent that it became descriptive of a product, rather than used as an identification of a source or origin of a product. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name. See MPEP 2173.05(u).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 16, 18, 21-23 and 28 stand and claim 4 is newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Duan et al (J. Clin. Invest. 105:1573-1587, 2000; *of record).

The claims are drawn to methods of enhancing recombinant adeno-associated virus (rAAV) transduction of a mammalian cell, the method comprising contacting the mammalian cell with at least one rAAV and at least two agents in an amount effective to enhance rAAV transduction.

To the extent that neither the instant specification nor the instant claims define the correlation between the identity and structural limitations of each composition/agent and the recited cellular effect achieved by that agent, the following rejection is applied.

This rejection is maintained for reasons of record in the office action mailed May 15, 2007 and re-stated below. The rejection has been re-worded slightly based upon Applicant's amendment filed August 14, 2007.

With respect to Claim 1, Duan et al teach a method of enhancing adeno-associated virus 2 (rAAV-2) transduction of human airway epithelial cells, the method comprising contacting the cells with rAAV, a first agent that is EGTA that has been shown to increase AAV transduction from the apical surface by seven- to ten-fold (pg 1580, col. 2, last 6 lines), and a second agent that is the tripeptide protease inhibitor LLnL, wherein the combined administration of EGTA and LLnL is greater than either agent alone (pg 1576, Figure 5).

With respect to Claims 2, 9 and 18, Duan et al teach the AAV vector to comprise a marker gene, specifically Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) (pg 1574, Methods, see also references cited therein).

With respect to Claim 4, Duan et al teach that EGTA and LLnL alters cellular uptake of rAAV (pg 1581, col. 1, lines 10-14).

With respect to Claims 5-7, Duan et al teach the agents enhanced transduction by at least 10 fold (pg 1576, Figure 5).

With respect to Claims 16 and 22, Duan et al teach the cell to be human airway (lung) epithelial cells.

With respect to Claim 21, Duan et al teach one of the agents to be LLnL.

With respect to Claim 23, Duan et al teach that the cells are contacted with at least one agent (EGTA) before the cell is contacted with the virus (pg 1576, Figure 5, legend).

With respect to Claim 28, Duan et al teach that at least one of the agents (LLnL) modulates rAAV processing in the cell (pg 1582, col. 1, lines 5-7; col. 2, lines 15-17).

Thus, Duan et al anticipate Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 16, 18, 21-23 and 28.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that Duan et al. do not disclose the use of two or more agents to enhance rAAV transduction of a mammalian cell, where one of the agents is a chemotherapeutic, lipid lowering agent, antibiotic or food additive and another agent that is an inhibitor of proteosome proteolytic activity or where one of the agents is epoxomicin, doxorubicin, DOXIL®, daunorubicin, idarubicin, epirubicin, aclarubicin, simvastatin or tannic acid. Furthermore, EGTA is a chelator and therefore is not a species of the recited agent genus.

Applicant's argument(s) has been fully considered, but is not persuasive. EGTA is an art-recognized 'food additive' (e.g. US Patent 6,475,537; col. 4, lines 42-48; col. 5, lines 28-38),

wherein the chelation properties are used so as to prevent or deter food spoilage. LLnL is an art-recognized agent that inhibits proteosome proteolytic activity. Thus, Duan et al teach the use of two agents that enhance AAV transduction, thereby fulfilling the limitations of the claimed agents. Furthermore, claim 1 does not recite the limitation "where one of the agents is epoxomicin, doxorubicin, DOXIL®, daunorubicin, idarubicin, epirubicin, aclarubicin, simvastatin or tannic acid".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1, 10-17 and 19-20 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Duan et al (J. Clin. Invest. 105:1573-1587, 2000; *of record) and Englehardt (U.S. Patent 6,436,392).

This is a new rejection.

Duan et al teach a method of enhancing adeno-associated virus 2 (rAAV-2) transduction, the method comprising contacting human lung cells with rAAV, a first agent that is EGTA that

has been shown to increase AAV transduction from the apical surface by seven- to ten-fold (pg 1580, col. 2, last 6 lines), and a second agent that is the tripeptide protease inhibitor LLnL, wherein the combined administration of EGTA and LLnL enhanced rAAV cellular uptake and transduction by at least 10 fold more than either agent alone (pg 1576, Figure 5). Duan et al teach the AAV vector to comprise a first DNA segment comprising a 5' ITR linked to a second DNA segment comprising a heterologous DNA linked to a third DNA segment comprising a 3' ITR, wherein the second DNA segment comprising a heterologous DNA encodes a marker gene, specifically Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) (pg 1574, Methods, see also references cited therein). Duan et al teach that at least one of the agents (LLnL) modulates rAAV processing in the cell (pg 1582, col. 1, lines 5-7; col. 2, lines 15-17).

Duan et al do not teach the method further comprising a second rAAV comprising a first DNA segment comprising a 5' ITR linked to a second DNA segment comprising a heterologous DNA which has sequences that are different than the sequences in the second DNA segment of the first recombinant DNA molecule linked to a third DNA segment comprising a 3' ITR. However, at the time of the invention, Englehardt disclosed methods of transducing mammalian cells comprising at least two different rAAV vectors, wherein the second DNA segment comprising a heterologous sequence of the first vector is different from the second DNA segment comprising a heterologous sequence of the second vector. Englehardt disclosed wherein the second DNA segment of the first recombinant DNA molecule comprises a portion of an open reading frame for a gene product, optionally operably linked to at least one transcriptional regulatory element, and a splice donor site 3' to the portion of the open reading frame, and wherein the second DNA segment of the second recombinant DNA molecule comprises a splice acceptor site 5' to the remainder of an open reading frame, which together with the second DNA segment of the first recombinant DNA molecule encodes a functional gene product, substantially as claimed (col. 4, line 47-col. 5, line 25), wherein the transcriptional regulatory element comprises a promoter and an enhancer (col. 16, lines 1-6), and wherein the functional gene product is a therapeutic polypeptide, e.g. cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) (col. 3, line 30; col. 49, lines 23-48). Englehardt disclosed that the rAAV vectors form heteroconcatamers, which increased persistence of transgene expression, and thereby enhances the expression of the functional gene product (col. 3, lines 39-41; col. 10, lines 24-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the rAAV vector(s) of Duan et al for the rAAV vectors taught by Englehardt with a reasonable chance of success because at the time of the invention, the art had long-recognized the ability to co-transfect mammalian cells with a mixed rAAV population comprising at least two different rAAV vectors. The level of skill of the ordinary artisan is considered to be high and the simple substitution of one rAAV population for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. An artisan would be motivated to use an rAAV population comprising two at least two different rAAV vectors because a two-rAAV-vector system based on the prior knowledge in the art regarding the molecular structure of rAAV concatamers may greatly increase the usefulness of rAAV gene therapy vectors for those genes, e.g. CFTR, whose cDNA barely fits into an rAAV vector and whose expression has been hampered by the inefficient promoter activity of the rAAV ITR.

Thus, the invention as whole is *prima facie* obvious.

8. **Claims 1 and 24 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Duan et al (J. Clin. Invest. 105:1573-1587, 2000; *of record) and Englehardt (U.S. Patent 6,436,392), as applied to claims 1, 10-17 and 19-20 above, and in further view of Hirsch et al (US 2003/0003583).

Neither Duan et al nor Englehardt teach the method to comprise the step wherein the cell is contacted with the virus before the cell is contacted with at least one agent. However, at the time of the invention, Hirsch et al disclose a method of infecting mammalian host cells with a rAAV, the method comprising the administration of a proteasome inhibitor, e.g. LLnL (pg 2, [0021]; pg 10, [0117-0128]), wherein the proteasome inhibitors may be administered at any time before, during or after the administration of the virus (pgs 10-11, [0130]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Duan et al to comprise the order of cell contacting steps as taught by Hirsch et al with a reasonable chance of success because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results. An artisan would be motivated to contact a cell with a proteasome inhibitor after having contacted

the cell with an rAAV virus because it is well within the common sense of the ordinary artisan to recognize three delivery combinations, before, during or after, and choosing any one of the three is standard practice when optimizing a method.

Thus, the invention as whole is prima facie obvious.

9. **Claims 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 54 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Duan et al (J. Clin. Invest. 105:1573-1587, 2000; *of record) in view of Kiyomiya et al (Cancer Res. 61:2467-2471, 2001; *of record in IDS).

Duan et al teach a method of enhancing adeno-associated virus 2 (rAAV-2) transduction, the method comprising contacting human lung cells with rAAV, a first agent that is EGTA that has been shown to increase AAV transduction from the apical surface by seven- to ten-fold (pg 1580, col. 2, last 6 lines), and a second agent that is the tripeptide protease inhibitor LLnL, wherein the combined administration of EGTA and LLnL enhanced transduction by at least 10 fold more than either agent alone (pg 1576, Figure 5). Duan et al teach the AAV vector to comprise a marker gene, specifically Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) (pg 1574, Methods, see also references cited therein). Duan et al teach that at least one of the agents (LLnL) modulates rAAV processing in the cell (pg 1582, col. 1, lines 5-7; col. 2, lines 15-17).

Duan et al do not teach the rAAV express a therapeutic or prophylactic gene product (claim 49); however, Duan et al teach that AAV vectors are known in the art as a gene therapy vehicle and have been used in strategies conceived for functional correction of the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR; pg 1573, col. 1, Introduction). Absent evidence to the contrary, nothing non-obvious is seen with substituting the marker gene for a therapeutic or prophylactic gene in an AAV vector because the art has long recognized and used AAV vectors for gene therapy.

Duan et al do not teach the method to comprise the use of the agent DOXIL®. However, at the time of the invention, Kiyomiya et al taught that adriamycin (a synonym for doxorubicin, the active agent in DOXIL®) is a proteasome protease inhibitor.

Kiyomiya et al do not teach the DOXIL® to modulate rAAV processing in the cell. However, absent evidence to the contrary, such cell biological activities are inherent features of the agent and are necessarily achieved by the enhanced rAAV transduction when EGTA and

DOXIL® are used in combination. Duan et al teach that ubiquitination of the viral capsid appears to be a major barrier responsible for altering the efficiency of trafficking the virus to the nucleus and/or nuclear processing events needed to convert its single-stranded DNA genome to a transcriptionally actived state (pg 1574, col. 1, ¶1). Thus, a proteasome inhibitor such as adriamycin will necessarily modulate rAAV processing in the cell because the agent interferes with the proteasome-mediated degradation of ubiquitinated rAAV viral capsids.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to try substituting the proteasome inhibitor LLnL for the proteasome inhibitor adriamycin with a reasonable chance of success because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this lead to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation, but of ordinary skill and common sense. An artisan would be motivated to try substituting LLnL for adriamycin because the genus of art-recognized inhibitors of proteasome protease activity embracing the proteasome inhibitor species LLnL also embraces the proteasome inhibitor species adriamycin.

Conclusion

10. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin K. Hill, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-8036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, between 9:00am-6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph T. Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Q. JANICE LI, M.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER